REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for acknowledging reconsideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 4, 2006, and July 6, 2007, by the return of the signed Forms PTO-1449 attached to the above-noted Information Disclosure Statements. In reviewing these Information Disclosure Statements it is noted that the seven Japanese documents that had previously been crossed out have now been considered.

Applicants also would like to thank the Examiner for the withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1-8.

Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1 and 3-8 have been amended, claim 2 has been cancelled, and new claim 9 has been added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application.

In the Final Official Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MASATOSHI (JP 06-309231).

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASATOSHI (JP 06-309231) in view of YASUTO (JP 08-069417).

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASATOSHI (JP 06-309231) in view of TAMOTSU (JP 61-016348).

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASATOSHI (JP 06-309231) in view of PATERU (JP 09-259036).

In the Final Official Action, the Examiner asserted that the inclusion of expressions such as "operable to" in Applicants' claims did not result in any structural differences between the claimed invention and the applied prior art. Without acquiescing to the appropriateness of this

matter, the amendment has amended all of the claims to remove such expressions as "operable to" and "operable" from the claims.

With regard to the anticipation rejection of independent claims 1 and 8, as stated above the expressions "operable to" and "operable" have been removed from the claims by the amendment. Applicants submit that both independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to be clearly allowable. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to explicitly recite that the holding unit stores a specific address range according to a data transfer instruction for transferring data to the holding unit and that the holding unit is configured to include a register that can be accessed by the processor through an instruction.

Amended claim 1 is now characterized by the setting of an address range in a register using a normal data transfer instruction instead of a dedicated instruction since the processor is merely specifying an address range. According to this structure, a programmer knows at the time of writing a program that the data will not be rewritten thereafter. Thus, when such data is present within the cache memory, the programmer can control the operation so as to accurately write back data that must be written back, by deliberately inserting a data transfer instruction. Therefore, the occurrence of write back penalties can be easily time-dispersed.

In contrast, MASATOSHI's system performs write back operations from the cache to the memory when the memory bus is idle. In particular, Applicants submit that MASATOSHI's system fails to disclose a holding unit that stores a specific address range according to a normal data transfer instruction for transferring data to the holding unit, which results in write back penalties being time-dispersed. An advantage of Applicants' storing of the address range in the holding unit that is performed according to a data transfer instruction is that there is no need to add a new dedicated instruction. Thus, there is no need to select a particular type of processor since the claimed invention can be easily implemented with any processor. In addition, by

holding an address range in a register before hand, the addition unit adds a caching termination attribute independently of the operation of the processor. Therefore, the processing load of the processor can be kept to a minimum, and a caching termination attribute can be added at the appropriate time while maintaining synchronization with the operation of the processor.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that MASATOSHI fails to disclose each and every feature of Applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 1, and that independent claim 1 contains patentable subject matter. Also, independent method claim 8 has been amended to include similar limitations to that discussed above and is also believed to be patentable. Claims 5-6 and new claim 9 depend from independent claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, and additionally for the features recited therein.

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, and additionally for the features recited therein. Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over the combination of MASATOSHI in view of YASUTO.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, and additionally for the features recited therein. Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of MASATOSHI in view of TAMOTSU.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, and additionally for the features recited therein. Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over the combination of MASATOSHI in view of PATERU.

SUMMARY

From the amendments, arguments, and remarks provided above, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims in the present application are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Final Official Action is respectfully requested and an indication of the allowance of claims 1 and 3-9 is now believed to be appropriate.

Applicants note that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance , and should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between the claims prior to the present amendment and the amended claims. Further, no acquiescence as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections is made by the present amendment. All other amendments to the claims which have been made by this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Hazuki OKABAYASHI et al.

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29027

Steven Wegman
Reg. No. 31,486

October 28, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191